

Message

From: Tony Verreos [Tony@verreos.com]
Sent: 8/17/2017 2:26:21 AM
To: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Subject: AUG 16, 2017 RE: Community concern - material from Hunters Point going to Brisbane Landfill?

Hi Lily,

Thanks for the referral to Nina.

FYI: this afternoon's mtg. included a Q about HPNS radiation which seemed to be based on a misunderstanding of the technical language being used by the Navy in one of their handouts. Both Michelle and Roger Kintz then explained that not all radiation is life threatening, and in some cases the preferred method of dealing with is it to bury it, rather than to risk moving it. This was actually the first time I heard that explained.

Reading the Navy's History of Parcel E-2 handout dated August 2017 makes a strong case for there being no problems. They have everything well under control. I'd certainly like to be able to believe that. I saw nothing in their flyer that raised

Any concerns except for their comments on sea level rise where they purposely omitted what level of "significant sea level rise" they are planning for? 4', 6', 8', 10' or more?

One of the reasons I'm interested in this case is that we are currently discussing the plans for proposed development of the 600+ acres of old railyard and San Francisco dump called the Brisbane Baylands. It will likely involved almost every question applying to HPNS with the possible exception of the radiation component. It is a big political hot potato with many residents claiming "the land will never be safe for housing." It's my impression that is rarely true, and that if the development were a Golden Gateway type high rise, people would be considered to be separated sufficiently from the buried contaminants. The battle of the experts has so far not made this point perfectly clear.

In the case of Greenaction – nothing about the EPA was said today until we had private conversations. Then it sounded as though valid Q's were raised about whether Greenaction's claims relative to the radiation risks in particular were

Valid and proper, or unfairly alarmist? You are a better judge of that than I. I know you can't compel the Navy to communicate more openly, too bad, as that would help everyone. I think the environmental watchdog role has proven very

Unfortunately to be needed due to a long list of government and private enterprise failures, however, in this case maybe Greenaction could be acting more obstructionist than as a facilitator?

The Mayor's Citizen's Advisory Committee may not impress a lot of people. It may be seen as a rubber stamp by many. But it is all that is needed to give the Mayor the cover of legitimacy so he can say the community was involved every step of the way. It seems to me that most of the community is neither involved or very interested in what they can't afford.

Tony

Tony

Anthony Verreos

V E R R E O S Insurance Agency 200 Valley Dr. #20, Brisbane, CA 94005

WORKING FOR YOU

Since 1956

CDI #0585599 www.verreos.com See us on Yelp! Please share with your friends

Tel: 415-467-9600 www.mrinsurancebroker.com

CA only: 800-464-1397

LEGAL NOTICE/PRIVACY: This email, including any attachments, is proprietary, and intended to remain confidential. All information contained herein is intended only for the identified addressee/recipient. In accordance with California and federal privacy laws: if you are not the intended recipient of this message, please advise us by return email or phone, and do not use, retain, copy, forward, disclose or distribute any part of this information by any means in any format.



Virus-free. www.avast.com